

ID 65. By amending the specification and drawings as set forth above, it is believed that these objections have been overcome.

With regard to the object that the drawings do not show the plurality of snaps and a plurality of hook members as described in the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection thereto has been overcome by the cancellation of claims 37-39.

The present invention is directed to an improved album leaf and system for displaying, storing, and retrieving images which comprises an album leaf having images and icons formed thereon. That is to say that the images and icons are an integral part of the album leaf. As clearly described and discussed in the specification at page 5, line 20 and continuing on to page 6, the images are printed directly on to the media. Thus, the present invention is not directed to an album leaf where images are loosely affixed to the leaf at some later point but one wherein the images and icons are integrally formed thereon. The independent claims have all been amended to clearly set forth that the images and icons are formed thereon. Additionally, the claims clearly set forth that the icons provide information for identifying the source from which the images originate. In the particular embodiment illustrated, this icon is used to identify the film cartridges. An important part of the present invention is that both the images and icons are integrally formed and that there is no other retaining function to be provided by the customer. This clearly avoids any potential mix-up or transposition that may occur due to a customer trying to put this information on album leaf at a later point in time. Both the images and icons are permanently affixed to the leaf.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 13, 18, 19, 25, 30, 35, 36, 40, 45, 46, 52, 57 and 58 under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Manico et al. (U.S. Patent 5,791,692) in view of Ruebens (U.S. Patent 4,965,948). The '692 reference merely discloses an album leaf that is forms a part of the present invention. However, there is not teaching or suggestion for providing the icons as taught and claimed by Applicant. The Ruebens reference is merely directed to an album page in which pockets are provided for retaining separate prints. This is totally apart and distinct from the images which are formed directly on the leaf. Furthermore, the Rueben merely discloses places on which someone may place writing (See col. 4, lines 48-56). Clearly the images of Rueben are provided on the leaf as claimed by Applicant. Thus, the Rueben and Manico together or individually fail to teach or suggest the claims as taught and claimed by Applicants.

The Examiner has also 2-5, 14-17, 26-29, 41-44, and 53-56 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico et al. in view of Ruebens and further in view of Rowley (U. S. Patent 5,765,875). The '875 subject claims depend at

least ultimately upon the independent previously discussed which have been shown to be patentably distinct over the cited Manico and Ruebens reference. The Rowley reference does not teach or suggest anything additional which would render the independent claims upon which the subject claims depend obvious. The IDs which are illustrated in the Rowley reference are removable and not a part of the leaf as claimed by Applicant. Nor is there anything that teach or suggest that this could be combined into a single integral album leaf to which the present invention is directed. Additionally, this disclosure is directed to the use of separate ID sheets 66. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Rowley reference does not teach anything which would render the claims of the present invention obvious.

The Examiner in paragraph 5 of the Official Action has rejected claims 8, 20, 31, 47 and 59 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico in view of Ruebins and further in view of Werner et al (U.S. Patent 5,709,496) for the reasons set forth therein. The Werner reference is again directed to an album leaf in which items are simply placed in the pockets. This is totally apart and distinct from the present invention where images are integrally formed as a part of the leaf. Further, the subject claims are depend at least ultimately upon independent claims which have been previously shown to be patentably distinct over the prior art. Werner et al. reference does not teach or suggest anything which would render Applicants' invention obvious.

The Examiner in paragraph 6 of the Official Action has rejected claims 9-11, 21-23, 32-34, 48-50 and 60-62 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manico in view of Ruebens and further in view of Combs (U.S. Patent 5,782,349) for the reasons set forth in paragraph 6. Here again, these claims depend ultimately on independent claims which have been shown to be patentably distinct over the prior art. The Combs reference merely teaches the providing of a CD in a pocket. Here again, Applicants' invention is directed to a integral album leaf wherein the images and indicia are integrally formed as a part of the leaf. This is not taught or suggested in the Combs reference. Accordingly, the Combs reference by itself or in combination with the previous reference could not teach or suggest the present invention for the same reasons previously discussed.

The Examiner in paragraph 8 of the Official Action has rejected claims 12, 24, 51 and 63 for the reasons set forth in paragraph 8. As previously discussed, these are dependent claims which depend at least ultimately upon an independent claim which have been shown to be patentably distinct and therefore are patentably distinct for the same reasons previously discussed.

In summary Applicants respectfully submits that the claims in their present form are patentably distinct over the prior art cited accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/djs
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (716) 726-1111
Facsimile: (716) 726-9178